



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/064,001

06/03/2002

Yinghui Dan

MONS:130US

7199

73905

7590

04/23/2009

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

P.O. BOX 061080

SOUTH WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER

CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, KEITH O NEAL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1638

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/23/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/064,001	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> KEITH O. ROBINSON	<b>Art Unit</b> 1638	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) KEITH O. ROBINSON. (3) DAVID KRUSE.

(2) ANNE MARIE GRUNBERG. (4) RON LABY.

Date of Interview: 16 April 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 13.

Identification of prior art discussed: Bowen (US Patent 5,736,369), Zhong (Planta 187: 483-489, 1992), Fry (US Patent 5,631,152), Eudes (US Patent 6,995,016).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued the differences between the Bowen reference and the claimed invention in that the Bowen reference teaches transformation target is meristem tissue and the claimed invention teaches bud tissue; also argued that the Zhong reference does not teach mesocotyl explant but instead teaches shoot tips; argued that the claimed invention teaches many transformation targets wherein the prior art teaches low events.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/David H Kruse/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1638	21 April 2009
--	---------------